

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-29 as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,393,014 to Daly et al. ("Daly"). Applicants note that "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdengaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814, F.2d. 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *see also* MPEP 2131. The Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, includes claim limitations that have not been shown by the Examiner.

Claims 1-9

Claim 1, as amended, recites a switch connected between a first network and a storage area network. Applicants submit that Daly does not teach a storage area network. Moreover, Applicants submit that there is no motivation in Daly to modify the teaching of Daly to include a storage area network as Daly addresses communicating data to mobile devices and mobile devices are not typically used in storage area networks. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Daly. Applicants further submit that Claims 2-10 are also allowable as being dependent on Claim 1.

Claim 2 recites that the storage area network is an in-band network. As described in the Specification, and in-band network is a private network that is not accessible by external networks such as the Internet. See page 2, lines 24-26. In other words, an in-band network can be accessed from an internal network, such as a LAN, but not an external network, such as the Internet. The Examiner rejected Claim 2 stating that "Daly discloses: wherein the first network is an out-of-band network and the second network is an in-band network (col. 1, lines 22-67, col. 2, lines 1-3, and col. 3, lines 17-32." Col. 1, lines 22-67 of Daly discuss connecting a computer to the Internet and connecting a mobile device to the Internet. Col. 2, lines 1-3 identifies a problem with prior art mobile device technologies is that those technologies could only connect to the internet in a data only mode, but not in a voice mode. Applicant, however, is unable to find any teaching or suggestion in these passages of an in-band network that is not accessible

from external networks. Col. 3, lines 17-32 of Daly discusses an architecture for connecting mobile device networks (e.g., a PCS network or CDPD network) to an IP network. There is no teaching that either of the mobile device networks or the IP network is an in-band network. Furthermore, Col. 6, lines 56-57 of Daly states that a teleservice server and web server are connected to the Internet. In this case, the teleservice server provides access to mobile devices on the mobile device networks from the Internet, suggesting that that mobile device networks are out-of-band networks. If the Examiner disagrees, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner more particularly point out where an in-band network can be found.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite that "the HTTP client is configured to forward corresponding requests formatted according to a fiber channel protocol to the second device on the storage area network." Applicants submit that the portions of Daly cited by the Examiner in rejecting Claim 3 do not teach forwarding an HTTP request according to a fiber channel protocol. Moreover, Applicants submit that there is no motivation in Daly to modify the teachings of Daly to include "forwarding the HTTP request according to a fiber channel protocol" as fiber channel protocols are not typically used for communicating with mobile devices.

Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to recite a default gateway separate from the switch and a proxy server separate from the switch. The Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 5 citing col. 4, lines 27-37. The portion cited by the Examiner reads:

The proxy 340 forms the information interface to the IP network. The proxy can request notification information from the dual messenger to obtain the application on the IP network which desires the transfer information. The identity of the application is typically a URL (universal resource locator) that is contained in notification information transmitted to the dual messenger by the application on the IP network. The proxy also then receives the data from the application and then transfers it to the mobile station via either the R-Data message handler or the wireless IP handler.

Applicants are unclear as to what the Examiner considers to be the proxy server and the default gateway. However applicants note that the proxy of Daly is located at the enhanced server. To the extent the Examiner interprets the enhanced server to be default gateway and the switch Applicants submit that Daly does not anticipate Claim 4 as the Claim 4 recites that the default gateway is separate from the switch. Similarly, Daly does not anticipate Claim 5 as the proxy is located at the enhanced server.

With respect to Claim 9, the Examiner states that Daly discloses that:

Each of the requests includes a keyword which indicates that the subject of the request should be forwarded to a device connected to the second network and wherein the switch is configured to identify the requests as being directed to the second device by detecting the keyword (abstract, col. 3, lines 17-67, col. 4, lines 1-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15).

Applicants note that, according to the present invention, the keyword can be part of the request that indicates how information in the request should be handled. For example, the keyword "Profile_A" in the request can indicate that information in the request is to be interpreted in a particular manner, whereas the keyword "Profile_B" can indicate that information in a request should be interpreted in a different manner. See page 20, lines 4-30 and page 21, lines 1-15. The portions of Daly cited by the Examiner recite generally how data is passed to computers or mobile devices from the Internet. Applicants have reviewed the portions cited by the Examiner and has failed to find any reference to the request including a "keyword" which indicates how information in the request should be handled and, more particularly, a keyword that indicates that the subject of the request should be forwarded to a device on the storage area network. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out where the "keyword" can be found or allow Claim 9.

Claims 11-22

Claim 11, as amended, recites that "the client is further configured to generate a second request and to transmit the second request to the device on the storage area network." Applicants submit that Daly does not teach a storage area network. Moreover, Applicants submit that there is no motivation in Daly to modify the teaching of Daly to include a storage area network as Daly addresses communicating data to mobile devices and mobile devices are not typically used in storage area networks. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 11 is allowable over Daly. Applicants further submit that Claims 12-22 are also allowable as being dependent on Claim 11.

Claim 12, as amended, recites that "the storage area network operates according to a fiber channel protocol." Applicants submit that the portions of Daly does not teach a storage area network that operates according to a fiber channel protocol. Moreover, Applicants submit that there is no motivation in Daly to modify the teachings of Daly to include a network that

operates according to a fiber channel protocol as fiber channel protocols are not typically used for communicating with mobile devices.

Claim 15 recites "transmitting the first request to a switching device comprises transmitting the first request to a device other than a default gateway." The Examiner rejected this claim citing col. 4, lines 27-37. This portion of Daly reads:

The proxy 340 forms the information interface to the IP network. The proxy can request notification information from the dual messenger to obtain the application on the IP network which desires the transfer information. The identity of the application is typically a URL (universal resource locator) that is contained in notification information transmitted to the dual messenger by the application on the IP network. The proxy also then receives the data from the application and then transfers it to the mobile station via either the R-Data message handler or the wireless IP handler.

Applicants note that the Examiner, in rejecting Claim 4, cited this same passage, describing the enhanced server, to show the presence of a default gateway. However, since requests are sent to the enhanced server in Daly, Applicants are unclear as to why the Examiner rejected Claim 15, which recites that the requests are sent to a device "other than the default gateway." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify how Daly shows sending the first request "to a device other than a default gateway" if the Examiner is considering the enhanced server to be the default gateway. Otherwise, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 15.

Applicants further note that similar reasoning applies to Claim 16 in that, in rejecting Claim 5, the Examiner pointed to the same passage of Daly (i.e., col. 4, lines 27-37), which discusses the enhanced server, as showing a proxy server. Applicants are again unclear as to why the Examiner rejected Claim 5 over this passage as showing a proxy server, but also rejected Claim 15 over this passage as showing sending the first request "to a device other than a proxy server," since the request of Daly is sent to the enhanced server described in the cited passage. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner more particularly point out how Daly shows "sending a first request to a device other than a proxy server" or allow Claim 16.

Claim 21 recites "the switching device identifying a keyword in the first request, wherein the keyword indicates the format of the information in the first request." With respect to this, the Examiner cites: abstract, col. 3, lines 17-67, col. 4, lines 1-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15. Applicants

note that the Examiner has pointed out large passages of Daly, without particularly pointing out where identifying a keyword that indicates the format of information in a request can be found. Applicants have reviewed the passages cited by the Examiner and cannot find a reference to identifying a keyword in a request that indicates the format of information in the request. The abstract reads as follows:

Methods and systems to communicate data to a mobile station. A request to transfer data from an internet Protocol (IP) network to a mobile station ca [sic] be received. Whether the mobile station is registered in a first network of a plurality of networks can be determined. The plurality of networks can include the first network operating under a first protocol and a second network operating under a second protocol, and the second protocol can be different than the first protocol. If the mobile station is registered in the first network, the data can be adapted to the be transferred via first network and transferred to the mobile station via the first network.

No portion of the abstract describes that a switching device identifies a keyword in the first request that indicates the format of information in the first request. Moreover, Col. 3, lines 17-67 generally describes connecting a mobile station to an IP network via an enhanced server and a teleservice server. Applicants have been unable to find any reference in this portion of Daly to the enhanced server or teleservice server identifying a keyword in a request that indicates the format of information in the request. Col. 4, lines 1-47 and col. 5, lines 1-15 further describe the interactions between various components of an enhanced server, teleservice server and mobile station. Again, Applicants have been unable to find any reference in this portion of Daly to the enhanced server or teleservice server identifying a keyword in a request that indicates the format of information in the request. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out where this feature can be found. Otherwise, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow Claim 21.

Claim 22 recites "parsing the information contained in the first request according to the format identified by the keyword." In rejecting this claim, the Examiner cited the same passages as in rejecting Claim 21. Applicants have reviewed these passages and have been unable to find any reference to parsing the information in a request based on a keyword in the request. Applicants, therefore, submit that Daly does not anticipate Claim 22. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner particularly point out where this feature can be found in Daly or allow the claim.

Claims 23-29

Claim 23 has been amended to recite generating "a second request" and transmitting "the second request to the device on the storage area network." Applicants submit that Daly does not teach a storage area network. Moreover, Applicants submit that there is no motivation in Daly to modify the teaching of Daly to include a storage area network as Daly addresses communicating data to mobile devices and mobile devices are not typically used in storage area networks. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 11 is allowable over Daly. Applicants further submit that Claims 24-29 are also allowable as being dependent on Claim 23.

Claim 24, as amended, recites that the storage area network "operates according to a fiber channel protocol." Applicants submit that the portions of Daly does not teach a storage area network that operates according to a fiber channel protocol. Moreover, Applicants submit that there is no motivation in Daly to modify the teachings of Daly to include a network that operates according to a fiber channel protocol as fiber channel protocols are not typically used for communicating with mobile devices.

Claim 25 recites that "the indicator comprises a predetermined keyword." In other words, the first request includes an indicator that is a predetermined keyword. Applicants have reviewed the portions of Daly cited by the Examiner and has been unable to find where Daly discloses or suggests an indicator that "comprises a predetermined keyword." If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner particularly point out where this feature can be found or allow Claim 25.

Claim 26 recites "the URL corresponding to the first request contains a URL following the keyword, wherein the client is configured to produce the URL following the keyword as the URL corresponding to the second request." This claim includes the feature that the first request includes a keyword and a second URL following the keyword. The client is configured to base the URL for the second request on the URL that appears after the keyword. Applicants have reviewed the portions of Daly cited by the Examiner (i.e., the abstract, col. 3 lines 17-67, col. 4, lines 1-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15) and have been unable to find a first request that includes "a URL following [a] keyword" or a client configured to "produce the URL following the keyword as the URL corresponding to the second request." Therefore, Applicants submit that the portions

of Daly cited by the Examiner do not anticipate Claim 26. Applicants accordingly request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 26.

Claim 27 recites that "the HTTP server is configured to detect URLs containing a keyword and the HTTP client is configured to generate new URLs corresponding to the detected URLs, wherein the new URLs do not contain the keyword." Applicants have been unable to find any teaching that the HTTP client is configured to generate new URLs corresponding to detected URLs that contain a keyword, wherein the new URLs do not contain the keyword. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 27 is not anticipated by Daly. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner more particularly point out where the features of Claim 27 can be found in Daly or allow Claim 27.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected Claim 6 as being unpatentable over Daly in light of United States Patent Number 6,266,701 to Sridhar et al. ("Sridhar"). More particularly, the Examiner states that Sridhar discloses a communication system that "comprises a firewall that is separate from the switch." The Examiner further states that "it one have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Daly by including a firewall between the networks in order to examine each message entering or leaving the network" Applicants note, however, that if the firewall is placed between the networks, as suggested by the Examiner, it would be placed at the enhanced server (i.e., the connection between the IP network and the mobile device networks). To the extent that the Examiner interprets the enhanced server to be the switch, Applicants note that to place the firewall between the networks would place the firewall at the enhanced server/switch. Therefore, the firewall would not be separate from the switch as recited in Claim 6. If Applicants have misinterpreted the Examiners argument, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner point out how Sridhar and Daly can be combined to produce the present invention as Claimed.

NEW CLAIMS 30-36

New Claims 30-36 are intended to more particularly point out distinguishing features of the present invention. More particularly, Claims 30-36 are drawn to the fact that the first request can include a keyword that indicates the format of information in the request. Based on the keyword the switch can determine how to process the request. For example, a request can

include URL1/profile_A/information ("Request1") or URL1/profile_B/information ("Request2"). In this case, the keyword profile_A can, for example, indicate to the switching device that the information following the keyword is the URL of the destination device, whereas the keyword profile_B can indicate that the information following the keyword must be processed in some manner before generating a request to the destination device. The keyword in each request ("profile_A") or ("profile_B") can have predetermined significance to the switch such that switch can generate a different requests to the destination device(s) depending on whether Request1 or Request2 is received. As another example, the switch may generate a request to the destination device requesting a first set of parameters if Request1 is received, whereas the switch may generate a request to the destination device requesting another set of parameters if Request2 is received. In other words, the keyword in the request can be used to determine how other information in the request is interpreted by the switch. It should be noted that the foregoing is given by way of example only, and the keyword in a request can be arbitrarily chosen. Support for Claims 30-36 can be found at pages 20-21. Applicant has reviewed Daly and has been unable to find a teaching or suggestion that a request should contain a keyword indicating the structure of information in the request.

Conclusion

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 1-36. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0456 of Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich, LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich LLP
Attorneys for Applicant



John L. Adair
Reg. No. 48,828

Dated: January 30, 2004

1221 South MoPac Expressway, Suite 400
Austin, TX 78746-6875
Tel. (512) 457-7142
Fax. (512) 457-7001